

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/522,341	0	3/09/2000	David Leigh Donoho	UNIV0001 3293		
22862	7590	11/16/2004		EXAMINER		
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L				CARDONE, JASON D		
MENLO PARK. CA 94025				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•			2145		

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/522,341	DONOHO ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jason D Cardone	2145	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 02 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application and indication of the contraction	ition. A proper reply to a	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office fimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extens unt of the fee. The appropriate extens originally set in the final Office action;	sion ision ; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying th	he
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendmer	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NOT place the)
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15,24-36,45 and 46</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16-23, 37-4			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	roved or b) disapproved by tl	ne Examiner.	
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	_ ·	
10. Other:		Jason D Cardone	
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2145	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: these arguments should have been presented before the Final Office Action. Canale does disclose "arbitrary combination of computationally verifiable conditions" and a limitation that "optionally occurs". Canale discloses having a user model to verify the conditions to send an email [Canale, col. 3, lines 37-55]. The broadest interpretation of "arbitrary combination of computation" would be working with a variable [ie. user model]. The claim is not more specific with this limitation. Canale disclose relevance evaluation through the use of the user model. Since the claim only discloses "optionally occurs" in a remote place, Canale discloses this by having another computer or optionally not [ie. 105 in figure 1,Canale, col. 3, lines 13-23 and col. 10, line 50 - col. 11, line 2].